AMENDMENTS TO THE CLAIMS

1. (Original) A computer-implemented method of matching an offer for a product with a supplier, comprising:

receiving the offer from a customer machine;

obtaining at least one quote for the product from each of a plurality of suppliers and obtaining at least two quotes from one supplier in the plurality of suppliers, a first quote from the one supplier being lower than a second quote from the one supplier;

identifying a qualifying quote for the product from each of the quotes obtained from the plurality of suppliers;

comparing the qualifying quotes from each of the quotes obtained to identify a mostpreferential quote of the qualifying quotes;

if the offer exceeds the most-preferential quote, matching the offer with the supplier corresponding to the most-preferential quote; and

evaluating any other quotes provided by the supplier corresponding to the mostpreferential quote.

- 2. (Original) The computer-implemented method of claim 1, wherein the offer includes a price and a description of the product.
- 3. (Original) The computer-implemented method of claim 1, wherein the product is a travel service.
- 4. (Currently amended) The computer-implemented method of claim 1, wherein, in case the one quote is the most-preferential quote, evaluating any other quotes comprises satisfying matching the offer with the second quote from the one supplier.
- 5. (Original) The computer-implemented method of claim 4, wherein the one quote is the lowest quote made by the one supplier.



LAW OFFICES OF
CHRISTENSEN O'CONNOR JOHNSON KINDNESSPLLC
1420 Fifth Avenue
Suite 2800
Seattle, Washington 98101
206.682.8100

6. (Original) The computer-implemented method of claim 4, further comprising negotiating a purchase of the product from the supplier corresponding to the most-preferential quote.

7. (Original) The computer-implemented method of claim 6, wherein negotiating the purchase of the product from the supplier includes making a reservation for a travel service provided by the supplier at a value corresponding to the second quote.

8. (Original) The computer-implemented method of claim I, wherein comparing the qualifying quotes from each of the quotes obtained includes calculating a value above which a particular quote is not economically viable and excluding quotes above the calculated value.

9. (Original) A computer-readable medium having computer-executable instructions, comprising:

receiving from a customer machine an offer representing a value that the customer is willing to exchange for a product;

receiving a set of quotes from each of a plurality of suppliers to provide the product, and receiving at least two quotes from one supplier in the plurality of suppliers, a first quote from the one supplier being lower than a second quote from the one supplier;

ranking each supplier in the plurality of suppliers according to the value of at least one quote in the set of quotes received from each supplier;

selecting a highest ranked supplier from the plurality of suppliers;

matching the offer from the customer with the highest ranked supplier; and

evaluating any other quotes provided by the supplier corresponding to the mostpreferential quote.

10. (Original) The computer-readable medium of claim 9, wherein the value of the one quote includes a price for the product.

11. (Original) The computer-readable medium of claim 10, wherein the value of the one quote includes a quality rating associated with the product quoted by the supplier.

12. (Original) The computer-readable medium of claim 9, wherein the value of the one quote includes a quality rating associated with the product quoted by the supplier.

13. (Currently amended) The computer-readable medium of claim 9, wherein, in case the one quote is the most preferential quote, satisfying matching the offer with the second quote from the one supplier.

14. (Currently amended) The computer-readable medium of claim 9, wherein the product includes a characteristic having a rating, the offer identifying an acceptable rating value and wherein the quote received from [[a]] each supplier identifies the rating of the product being quoted by that supplier.

15. (Original) The computer-readable medium of claim 14, wherein the product includes a travel service and the characteristic includes a quality of the travel service.

16. (Currently amended) A computer-implemented method for matching an offer for a product with a supplier, comprising:

receiving the offer from a customer machine, the offer identifying a price and a minimum acceptable quality for the product;

calculating a first value based on the offer that reflects a desired margin;

obtaining at least one quote for the product from each of a plurality of suppliers, each quote identifying a price for the product that [[the]] a corresponding supplier is ready to accept, each product quote also having a rating for the quality of the product being quoted by the corresponding supplier;

selecting one quote from each of the suppliers;

for those suppliers for which the one quote provided is below the second <u>first</u> value, ranking those suppliers based on the rating associated with the product being quoted by the supplier; and

selecting a most preferentially-ranked supplier as the match for the offer.

17. (Original) The computer-implemented method of claim 16, further comprising: calculating a second value, based on the offer, above which a quote for the product is not economically desirable; and

for those suppliers for which the one quote provided is between the first value and the second value, ranking those suppliers based on the cost associated with the corresponding quote.

- 18. (Currently amended) The computer-implemented method of claim 16, wherein obtaining at least one quote includes obtaining at least two quotes from one supplier in the plurality of suppliers, a first quote from the one supplier being lower than a second quote from the one supplier; and, in case the one quote is the most-preferential quote, satisfying matching the offer with the second quote from the one supplier.
- 19. (Original) The computer-implemented method of claim 16, wherein quotes having higher ratings are ranked at a higher level of preference.
- 20. (Original) The computer-implemented method of claim 19, wherein quotes having the same ratings are ranked in descending order of preference according to the cost associated with each quote.
- 21. (Original) The computer-implemented method of claim 17, further comprising selecting a quote provided by the most preferentially-ranked supplier as the quote that satisfies the offer.
- 22. (Original) The computer-implemented method of claim 21, wherein the quote that satisfies the offer comprises the lowest quote provided by the most preferentially-ranked supplier.

(1)

23. (Original) The computer-implemented method of claim 21, wherein the quote that satisfies the offer comprises a quote provided by the most preferentially-ranked supplier other than the lowest quote provided.

24. (Original) The computer-implemented method of claim 23, wherein the quote that satisfies the offer comprises the highest quote provided by the most preferentially-ranked supplier.

25. (Original) The computer-implemented method of claim 23, wherein the quote that satisfies the offer comprises the highest quote provided by the most preferentially-ranked supplier that is still below the first value.

26. (Currently amended) A computer-readable medium having computer executable instructions, comprising:

receiving an offer from a customer for a product, the product being subject to a criterion; calculating a first value, based on the offer, above which a quote for the product is not economically desirable;

calculating a second value based on the offer that reflects a desired margin;

obtaining from a plurality of suppliers at least one-quote for the product, each quote including a price at which [[the]] a corresponding supplier is prepared to provide the product and including a rating associated with the criterion of the particular product quoted by the corresponding supplier;

discarding from the plurality of suppliers those suppliers that do not provide a quote below the first value;

for those suppliers for which the one quote falls between the first value and the second value, ranking each supplier in the plurality of suppliers based on one quote provided by the suppliers, wherein the suppliers are ranked based on the price associated with the one quote provided by the suppliers;

. . .

for those suppliers for which the one quote falls below the second value, ranking each supplier based on the one quote provided, wherein the suppliers are ranked based upon the criterion; and

matching the offer with a most-preferentially ranked supplier.

- 27. (Original) The computer-readable medium of claim 26, further comprising negotiating a purchase of the product by the customer from the most-preferentially ranked supplier.
- 28. (Original) The computer-readable medium of claim 26, wherein the first value corresponds to the value of the offer adjusted for transactional costs associated with a purchase of the product.
- 29. (Original) The computer-readable medium of claim 26, wherein the second value corresponds to the value of the offer adjusted for transactional costs associated with a purchase of the product plus a desired profit.
- 30. (Original) The computer-readable medium of claim 26, wherein the criterion is a quality of the product quoted by a particular supplier.
 - 31. (Original) The computer-readable medium of claim 26, further comprising:

for those suppliers for which the one quote provided is below the second value, ranking those suppliers based first on the rating associated with the product being quoted by the supplier and based second on the price associated with the product.

32. (Currently amended) A computer system for satisfying offers with quotes, comprising:

an electronic travel agent, including:

a web server component configured to interface with a customer machine over a network connection and receive from the customer machine an offer for a product, the offer identifying a price for the product and a minimum quality rating for the product;

a travel server component configured to obtain from each supplier in a plurality of suppliers, at least one quote to provide the product at a price and at a particular quality rating;

a sorter component configured to rank the <u>plurality of</u> suppliers according to one quote provided by each of the plurality of suppliers with preferential rankings being awarded based on the quality rating associated with the corresponding quote; and

the electronic travel agent being further configured to match the offer with a most-preferentially ranked supplier and to negotiate a purchase of the product from the most preferentially-ranked supplier.

- 33. (Original) The computer system of claim 32, wherein the sorter component is further configured to rank the suppliers based first on the quality rating associated with the corresponding quote and second on the price associated with the corresponding quote.
- 34. (Original) The computer system of claim 32, wherein the electronic travel agent is further configured to negotiate a purchase of the product from the most preferentially-ranked supplier at a higher price than the price associated with the one quote provided by the most preferentially-ranked supplier.
- 35. (Original) The computer system of claim 34, wherein the higher price is the price associated with another quote provided by the most preferentially-ranked supplier.
- 36. (Currently Amended) The computer system of claim 32, wherein the sorter component is further configured to calculate a value, based on the offer, above which it is <u>not</u> economically practical to match the offer with a supplier.
- 37. (Original) The computer system of claim 36, wherein the sorter component is further configured to discard those suppliers that do not provide a quote below the calculated value.